RICHMOND LOCOMOTIVE WORKS.

MAY 23, 1910.—Ordered to be printed.

Mr. Millington, from the Committee on Claims, submitted the following

ADVERSE REPORT.

[To accompany H. R. 13629.]

The Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 13629) for the relief of the Richmond Locomotive Works, successor of the Richmond Locomotive and Machine Works, having considered the same, report thereon with a recommendation that it do not pass.

Your committee finds that this claim has been presented to Congress before and that the claim was not allowed, as will be seen by the following letter from the Navy Department dated January 10, 1905,

and signed by Wm. C. Morton, Secretary:

NAVY DEPARTMENT, Washington, January 10, 1905.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 7th instant inclosing a copy of an amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. Martin to the bill (H. R. 9548) for the allowance of certain claims for stores and supplies reported by the Court of Claims under the provisions of the Bowman Act and requesting an expression of the department's opinion as to the merits thereof, said amendment providing for the payment to the Richmond Locomotive Works, successor to the Richmond Locomotive and Machine Works, of the sum of \$10,490.96, in full settlement of its claim for damages and losses incurred in constructing the machinery for the battle ship *Texas*.

In this department's letter, dated December 20, 1895, to the Speaker of the House, referred to in the proposed amendment, the claim of the Richmond Locomotive and Machine Works, amounting to \$108,983.04, which had in accordance with the authorization contained in the naval appropriation act of March 2, 1895, been audited,

was allowed in the sum of \$80,049.30.

Said allowance included, with other items—

Interest	\$8,740.24
Insurance	
Security	600.00

10, 490, 96

to which the contractors were, in the opinion of the department, as stated in its said letter, justly and equitably entitled. These items were omitted by the Congress in appropriating for the payment of the claim in question, the reasons for which action are unknown to the department, but it is, after careful consideration of the matter, still of opinion that the contractors are entitled to and should receive the sum so deducted from their claim as audited and allowed.

Very respectfully, Wm. C. Morton, Secretary.